



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tians,—justify one nation in forcing its will on another at the mouth of the cannon? What would He who in His hour would not call for the twelve legions of angels who were not far from Him—what would He say to a war of annexation? It is useless to deny the fact—the shocking, the criminal fact—that we gave this government its renewed lease of power solely that it might annex those territories. Annexation or no annexation was the point at issue. Let us face it. Indeed, we cannot deny it, for our words remain to witness against us. Let us face our sin; let us confess it and repent of it. We have never yet expressed repentance. When we are obliged to refer to the war we talk about the blunders we made over it, and the money we wasted and were cheated out of, in the course of it—anything except the sin of going to war that a gold mine might be worked to larger profit. Until we see the sin of that, and until we make open confession of sin, all our speeches for peace and arbitration, all our efforts at palliating the horrors of war, will be hollow mockeries. All the while we are making our speeches a voice is saying in our ears, “Remember 1900!”

At the present war is not an accident with us; it is the mainspring of our national policy. In fact, it may be said to be our national policy, so far as we have one left, for “imperial” has swallowed up “national,” and the interests of the inhabitants of these islands are now systematically sacrificed to further schemes on the Northwest Frontier of India, in the jungles and deserts of Africa—anywhere, everywhere, so long as it is not a scheme to be carried out in Britain. Ever since we made gold mines, ruby mines, diamond mines, the grand objects of national policy, wars have multiplied, till they are now our chronic condition. Kano, Somaliland, China, Thibet, Venezuela—we have sent armaments to all these places, and have actually fought in three of them, in three years. So lightly do we regard war that we were on the very point of going to war in Venezuela for a trumpery £250,000! And all these affairs on the heels of the terrible South African campaigns! Surely it is time to fight the War Devil as determinedly as we fight the Drink Devil! But contrast the two movements: the one always in evidence, scorning compromise, thrusting itself into politics as a factor, proud of the warfare it wages; the other, shrinking from the odium of denouncing a popular war, uttering futile generalities; not even using the opportunity offered it by the Chinese Labor question to expose the true nature and objects of the great sin of our time.

What we want is a political party whose principles are the universal substitution of moral for physical force; the recognition of the Christian doctrine that no one nation has any inherent right to govern any other against its will; the belief that an end which demands evil means to bring it about cannot possibly be a good end; the further belief that a nation serves its own interests best by not wronging other nations; and that war is the very worst method of “expanding” influence and markets. A political party which held these principles and stood to them, not in vague generalities, but on the question of Thibet, of the Persian Gulf, and of every other part of the world on which the vultures of Imperialism have fixed their eyes—such a party would

be in this age what the party of Wilberforce and the anti-slavery men were eighty years ago: it would slowly leaven public opinion until it would be considered as strange and unreasonable a thing to be a Jingo as it was two years ago not to be one.—M.

An Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty.

Further Opinions of Prominent Men.

By Henry K. Carroll, LL. D., Secretary of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

I believe that a treaty of arbitration, such as is now proposed, between the United States and Great Britain, would mark a great advance in Anglo-Saxon civilization. The relations between the two great English-speaking nations are so friendly and cordial that advantage should be taken of them to negotiate an instrument which, in the stress which may come at any time upon our international friendship, would finally hold both in the ways of peace.

When the great bridge at St. Louis was nearly completed, it was found that the two halves of the great structure would not quite meet in the centre. An engineer was sent to New York to consult in the emergency. While he was trying to ascertain where the error lay, he received a telegram stating that the warm sun had stretched the iron so that the ends had come together. As quickly as lightning would carry it he sent word, “Clamp them,” and it was done.

While the warmth of friendly feeling has brought the two nations in which we are most interested closer together than ever before, let the clamps of arbitration be put on which shall make them one in the spirit of a lasting fraternal peace.

From J. G. Schurman, LL. D., President of Cornell University.

The movement now on foot to secure the ratification of an arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain, establishing, as it does, a basis for perpetual peace in the Anglo-Saxon world, and thus aiming to eliminate all barriers, sentimental or otherwise, which may at any time tend to separate these two kindred peoples, is a most important step forward, and should receive the encouragement and earnest support of every American citizen who has the best interests of his country at heart.

The rapid rise to positions of importance of races heretofore backward and undeveloped is swiftly bringing conditions to a point where Anglo-Saxon supremacy will depend to a large extent upon Anglo-Saxon unity, and nothing could serve better to accomplish this latter result than an arrangement like that proposed whereby the two Anglo-Saxon nations should agree to submit to a board of arbitration all questions arising between them which may prove to be unsatisfactory of a satisfactory adjustment through diplomatic negotiations. And such action on the part of these, the two greatest world powers, could not fail to have a wholesome influence in promoting peace among all peoples.

From Walter S. Logan, former President of the New York State Bar Association.

There ought to be a broad, liberal and comprehensive treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great

Britain. Our race has come to rule the world and our language is fast coming to be a world language. The two greatest and most civilized nations of the world are the two nations whose people speak the English language, who have made Saxon institutions the basis of their government, and who have built their social structure upon the foundation rock of individual self-reliance. The successful efforts we have made on behalf of human liberty have fired the hearts of patriots the world over so that now the world looks up to us and follows, not so much because of our power as because of what we have done for freedom and humanity.

The direct result of an arbitration between our nation and England is to my mind the least important result. So far as the two nations are concerned, we can if need be settle our future difficulties as we have our difficulties in the past — since 1812 — by special arbitration treaties made to meet the special emergency. We have shown that we have in both nations men broad enough, high-minded enough, and of judicial independence enough to decide even against their own country when the law and the facts require such a decision. American judges joined in the decision against the United States at Geneva. An English judge joined in the decision against England on the Alaska boundary question. The United States could safely trust most any dispute of hers to the judicial decision of the judges of the House of Lords. England would, I believe, have faith enough in the fairness of the Supreme Court of the United States to submit if need be its controversies to them. We are not likely to go to war with England because of the want of an arbitration treaty.

But the example of such a treaty would be of inestimable value. It comes with bad grace from us to ask other nations to agree to submit their differences to arbitration when we, the two great English-speaking Saxon nations of the world, are not willing to submit ours to the same method of determination. Let us set the example and the world will be ready to follow it.

From William E. Griffiths, D. D., Author of "Brave Little Holland," etc.

I am earnestly hoping that the arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain will during this year become an accomplished fact with the force of the law. Surely, by this time, the statesmanship of the two nations using the same language and holding to the same general view of justice, righteousness, and the brotherhood of nations ought to be able to settle any technical obstacles in the way. The experiences since 1897 have served but to emphasize the inherent unity of the two great English-speaking nations.

From Josiah Strong, D. D., President American Institute of Social Service.

In a second effort to secure a treaty of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States, it will be encouraging to know that the Senate, in refusing to ratify the former treaty, misrepresented public sentiment in America.

When the treaty was before the Senate and in danger of being amended to death, it fell to me to prepare a memorial to that body in behalf of the National Arbitration Committee.

I addressed all of the governors, the members of the Supreme Courts of all the States, and the members of

the United States Courts, the presidents of one hundred leading universities and colleges, the bishops of all churches having bishops, the most eminent clergymen, journalists, lawyers, publicists, students of international law, and captains of industry, in short the foremost citizens of the nation — the men who make public sentiment. The question asked was, "May we quote you as standing with the National Committee of Arbitration in favor of the ratification of the treaty without amendment?"

A thousand and two replies were received. Of this number nine hundred and thirty-two, or nearly ninety-three per cent., expressed their preference for the treaty unamended. Most of the remainder were strongly in favor of the treaty, but for various reasons declined to be quoted. Only twelve expressed themselves as opposed to the treaty.

Rarely in our history have all sections, all parties and all religions been so unitedly in favor of one policy.

The same reasons for such a treaty exist now as then.

From David James Burrell, D. D., of the Dutch Reformed Church, New York.

It is greatly to be desired that England and America should clasp hands in the interest of universal peace. It is not necessary to base this proposition upon any such false and fallacious statements as that both nations are of common blood or founded on identical principles. The main current in the arteries of our heterogeneous commonwealth is not English; and our fundamental thesis of human equality is in direct contravention of the English philosophy of *jus divinum* and the titled orders. Moreover, while both people are Protestant, they are distinctly and irreconcilably at odds in their respective views of the mutual relations of Church and State. But we both belong to the sisterhood of Anglo-Saxon nations and speak dialects of the same Anglo-Saxon tongue. We are, moreover, the two strongest governments on earth and, as such, would form an irresistible combination. The end aimed at would be a foregone conclusion if England and America, leading the way, were to induce the other Germanic and correlated nations to unite with them. The only question is whether a dual alliance would be better, at the outset, than a federation of all nations of kindred blood and language. Why should we not have the support of Germany and Holland, so closely bound to us not only by the cousinship of Anglo-Saxon blood, but by their coöperation in the historic campaigns of civil and ecclesiastical freedom? The mere suggestion of such an alliance is fraught with glorious dreams and prophecies of peace on earth and good will among men.

Philippine Independence Committee.

Charles F. Adams, Massachusetts.

Dr. Felix Adler, New York.

James M. Allen, California.

W. H. Baldwin, Jr., New York.

Gen. R. Brinkerhoff, Ohio.

Geo. Burnham, Jr., Pennsylvania.

Andrew Carnegie, New York.

President Geo. C. Chase, Maine.

R. Fulton Cutting, New York.

President Charles W. Eliot, Massachusetts.

Philip C. Garrett, Pennsylvania.